Remarks

In this Response, claims 19-30 are canceled, without prejudice; and claims 31-61 are added. These added claims are fully supported by the originally filed application. No new matter is added.

Claims 31-66 are presented for examination.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19, 21, 22, 26, 27, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Edsall et al (US 2003/00118053) (hereinafter "Edsall"). These claims have been cancelled, without prejudice, rendering these rejections moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 20, 23 - 25, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over various cited references including Edsall, McCanne et al (US 7120666) (hereinafter "McCanne"); Kobayashi (US 20010026550) (hereinafter "Kobayashi"); and Ohran (US 20010037371) (hereinafter "Ohran"). These claims have been cancelled, without prejudice, rendering these rejections moot.

Added claims

The Applicants have taken this opportunity to add claims 31 – 66. None of the references previously cited teach or make obvious these claims. For example, none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a first identifier segment in a control portion of an encapsulating packet to identify a storage area of a target device and a second identifier segment in a control portion of an encapsulated packet to identify a storage block of the storage area.

Edsall teaches inclusion of a virtual storage area network (VSAN) identifier in a frame header to facilitate routing of network traffic to a member of the VSAN. Thus, only one identifier is disclosed and there is nothing to teach, suggest, or imply first and second identifier segments, much less that the segments are disposed in various portions of an encapsulating/encapsulated packet as recited in claim 31, for example.

- 13 -

McCanne is relied upon for teachings regarding a client sending a request for a data block to a server. None of the cited portions are germane to the above-discussed claim recitations.

Kobayashi teaches a packet having an IP option area for IP addresses indicative of a path between a source address and a destination address. Paragraph [0066]. Thus, the addresses are for different devices, not for a storage area of a target device and a storage block of the storage area as recited in claim 31, for example.

Ohran is relied upon for teachings regarding communications between servers. None of the cited portions are germane to the above-discussed claim recitations.

For at least these reasons, these claims are patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

For these reasons, a Notice of Allowance, allowing claims 31-66, is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at 503-796-2084. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: August 13, 2008

/Nathan R. Maki/

Nathan R. Maki
Reg. No. 51,110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981

Attorney Docket No. 119127-160998
Application No. 10/791,338

0963USCN145721